

JUG News

October 2004

Issues and news for Judges and Umpires

“So Watt?”

Notes from Chairman Chris Watts

The next couple of months sees the lead up to the launch of the RYA’s Culture initiative. The official launch is at the RYA Wyboston December Conference where hopefully many of you will be attending. This is the first step to try and tackle bad behaviour and reclaim all areas of the sport for those that believe that there should be no room for cheating and abuse of other sailors and the rules.

The core element to the Culture initiative is for sailors, clubs and classes to state publicly that they will not tolerate this sort of behaviour and to be committed to taking action to stopping it.

The problems and concerns are not common to all classes. Some

classes have managed to hold on firmly to principles of good sportsmanship and deal with those who might threaten them, but even they feel under pressure as new sailors arrive from other classes. Others seem to have almost given up as sailors report of being hit by give way boats, who when challenged reply “So what?” There is the club whose Commodore has apparently sold his boat to get away from an alleged bully and cheat in their club racing.

It is a very interesting set of replies, to the question of why did you not do something about it? Some do nothing through fear of reprisals, some through a fear of losing a straight forward protest because the other person will lie, but most because they do not want to ruin the partying part of the weekend stuck outside some protest room. Not popular with partners and not nearly so much fun. So those that continue to cheat, continue to say “So what?”

I was asked to observe a well known multi class open meeting weekend on the Solent this year. In a short period of time I witnessed port boats hitting starboard ones, up hill and down hill; boats grabbing hold of others to pull themselves up to the front row of the start line; crews bouncing their boats off the startline, not just one or two bounces but between six and ten; marks being barged and rocking on the reaches. In all cases the boats around complained but did not protest and no turns were made. I was allowed to challenge the miscreants and each case they replied “So what?” and even “I needed to catch up.”

We are delighted to welcome one of their class officials to **Sally’s** Working party on mediation and quick hearings, and delighted that they are keen to act as a test bed for new ideas.

As judges we will have to play a central role in working with sailors, clubs and classes in providing information, expertise and

when required leadership. Already JUG has been tasked with producing a good judging guide. Most importantly all judges need to be feeding back good ideas and positive experiences so that they can be shared for everyone's benefit. Our newsletter is a perfect way of doing this, so please contribute.

We also have to support classes and **David Brunskill** is doing a sterling job organising help here.

On a different tack we should not only congratulate our wonderful Olympic team and their excellent support team, but also **Sally Burnett and John Doerr** who did an excellent job representing British judges. Well done all.

Chris Watts

Eurosaf Exchanges 2004

Before being able to offer you positions at European events for next year, I need to be able to offer an equivalent number of positions for visiting officials. I have to send off a completed list of GBR events in early November for our meeting in Istanbul 4 /5 December. Last year you managed to provide some 20 positions, which grew a little further when the Race Officers came up with a couple more. I need at least a similar number to take to the meeting. There will be a movement towards the principle of for every one we provide we will get one abroad. We filled over 30 positions abroad this year!

So if you or your club is involved in organising a largish event, I can help you with that extra pair of hands on the committee boat (probably a European NRO), or visiting (cheap) members of your International Jury. Remember that mostly they arrive at the event

with their travel being paid for by their own country, the few others, like us, pay for our own travel.

I have had many reports back from excellent events where the UK official had a brilliant time and I hope you have passed your notes to **Carol** for inclusion in this newsletter. On the other hand for a few of you there were some problems. Some of the southern European events are a little laid back on the management front and guidelines for contacting visiting officials are not always adhered to, until the week before the event! However, we have built up a good contact list of people to oil the wheels or threaten to do all sorts of things to get them in line. These people are often the equivalent of **Joanne** (in the RYA office) and work for their MNA. It is always worth copying your correspondence to them.

So although it is excellent to hear of the good bits and I will feed those back at the meeting, I do also need detailed accounts of where it may not have gone right, so that steps can be taken to try and stop it happening again.

I need your help and assistance and events to make the scheme work for UK judges, umpires and race officers.

Chris Watts

RYA updates from **Gordon Stredwick**

[Jo had a baby boy on Friday 24th September at 11.18 am. They have named him Oliver James and he weighed in at 7lb 13oz.](#)

Jo left us on maternity leave a few weeks ago and Georgina Vintner has joined us to cover. Georgie will be working 1030-1430 Monday to Friday. Her email address

is georgina.vintner@rya.org.uk but she'll also receive emails to Jo's address. We welcome Georgie and hope she enjoys her time with us.

Please note also: [The new YR1 - Racing Rules of Sailing 2005-2008 - £6.00 & YR7 - Handy Guide to the Racing Rules 2005-2008 - £2.80 - new rules in force from 1.1.05](#)

Gordon

David Brunskill reports on progress with the youth fleets

Judgeling 2005

RYA Junior and Youth Classes

Class Judges in 2005

It has become clear that we need to continue to build on the idea of providing a dedicated class judge for each of the RYA recognised Junior and Youth classes.

The commitment required would be normally five weekends and one full week depending on the regatta programme of the class concerned. Regular liaison with the class would be required. One weekend would include a visit to a National Junior Squad training weekend to work with coaches and GBR squad sailors. Attendance at other meetings including the committee of the class concerned may be helpful. There may an opportunity to meet up with class representatives in London at the time of the RYA Dinghy Sailing Show.

There would be a considerable amount of travel required to the various venues and a need to manage the judging arrangements for each event. Expenses will be payable.

In addition to the class judge there is likely to be a need for a deputy for each event and there will be opportunities for the development of RJ's or other judges throughout the programme.

A Eurosaf judge will be invited to assist at each of the National championships.

Provisional details are as follows

Cadet	Inlands	9 – 10 April	Rutland
	Int'l Indicator	30 April – 1 May	TBA
	Int'l Indicator	28 – 30 May	TBA
	Nationals (Portland)	14 – 19 August	WPSA
Mirror	Worlds Indicator	5 – 6 March	Chichester
	Worlds Indicator	16 – 17 April	Windermere
	Inlands	2 – 3 July	Staunton Harold
	NJS Indicator	3 – 4 September	Poole
	NJS Indicator	17-18September	Itchenor
Optimist	Joint Squad W/E	12 – 13 March	WPSA Portland
	Selector	8 -10 April	Pwllheli
	Selector	30 April - 2May	WPSA Portland
	Inlands	14- 15 May	Grafham Water
	Nationals	6 - 12 August	Pwllheli
	End Season	8 - 9 October	TBA

Topper	Inlands	30 April – 1 May	Grafham
	NJS Indicator	16 – 17 July	Stokes Bay
	Nationals	6 – 12 August	Largs
	NJS Indicator	27 – 28 August	Mumbles
	NJS Indicator	24 – 25 September	Carsington
420	Training	Jan, Feb, March,	tbc.
	World+Euro Selector 1	26/27 March	WPSA Portland
	World+Euro Selector 2	16/17 April	Mumbles
	World+Euro Selector 3	30 April - 2 May	Hayling I
	Nationals	20 - 26 August	WPSA Portland.
	Inlands	October	tbc.

A detailed job description of the role of class judge will be available in the very near future.

If interested please email david.brunskill@btinternet.com or phone 07788 185 307

Bill Brockbank writes about trialling a new idea in team race umpiring at the Daring International Team Racing, held at Cowes in July.

There's been a lot of debate about whether the umpires (who follow one team in any race) should introduce themselves to the watched boat. To begin with we did this as a common courtesy - anything which defuses any 'them vs us' between umpires and sailors helps as all. More recently consensus has swung towards not introducing, on the grounds that this gives an unfair advantage to the watched team.

To counter any temporary bias (it washes out over an event, each team is watched as often as it is not) by making it harder for both boats to know which umpire to turn to seems to me to miss the point - we should be making it easier for a wronged boat to get justice.

Everything we've tried so far (umpires wearing sail IDs, posting a list of RIBs and the sail numbers they will watch) has failed. In the heat of the moment the sailors always appeal to the nearest umpire. So this is what we tried in July.

The minute a valid protest was established the umpire handling that call would raise an arm, keeping it aloft until the 'reasonable time' to request an umpire decision expired (or the incident closed by a boat spinning or a decision being requested). This meant that a boat (watched or not) wanting a decision need only look for the umpire with their arm raised.

It didn't work all the time. We forgot; the sailors weren't used to it. On the other hand, that's not much worse than early experience with on-water umpires; with observing; with the single flag system; with everything else new.

I'll be trying this every time I can in future, and report further. In the meantime I commend it to all team race umpires.

The umpire only signals after a valid hail of protest and red flag because it's not our role to trigger protests, only to settle them

A date for your diary:

The RYA Judge & Umpire Conference 2005

will once again be in Nottingham. The dates are Feb 19 /20 2005. The provisional programme will be released in December but it will included items on the new rules as well as workshop sessions and details on the new RYA Charter.

Keeping Clear?

At a recent judges' conference a speaker posited the view that, if P is on a collision course with S and S waves P through and then alters course to avoid P, P has broken rule 10. It was further suggested that even if there were no protest from S, P had still broken rule 10 and should therefore take a penalty under 3(b). The logic of this argument concluded that if P did not take a penalty she should be disqualified (I cannot remember the mechanics of the DSQ but presumably something would be contrived under 60.2 or 60.3), and that the protest committee should then act under 60.3(c).

I've been wondering about this. I am not sure that, in the circumstances described, P does break rule 10. Rule 10 requires P to keep clear of S. If S waves her through, and she maintains her course, she has kept clear of S, even if S subsequently alters course to go round her (or, sneaky trick) tacks under her lee bow. Keeping clear, as we all know, does not mean 'shall not collide with'. By the same token it does not mean 'shall give way to' or 'shall alter course for'.

If S does alter course and then protests, this is surely grounds for a rule 2 protest (from either P or the Protest Committee). If S does not alter course (or does not do so enough) and there is contact (by definition both boats have now broken at least one rule) would it not be proper to exonerate P under 64.1(b) (S having broken at least one of rules 2, 14 or 16)?

Malcolm McKeag, NJ.

Time Limits: an Own Goal

Robert Milner takes a look at the Sailing Instructions

Has anyone actually asked - what is the objective of a race time limit? Authors of Sailing Instructions (SIs) happily include time limits with words, that we are invited by the authorities to follow, in the Appendix K guide, 14. This has an asterisk indicating the reference to J.2.1 (7) which states: "the time limit, if any, for finishing" which *shall* be included in the SIs. The Appendix K guide goes on to say in 14.2: Boats failing to finish within X after the first boats sails the course and finishes will be scored DNF. This changes rule 35 and A4.1. In other words, the pressure is to include time limits, in one form or another, in the SIs.

My second question is: What is the logic of Appendix K 14.2 changing rule 35? Surely the ISAF appendices should be supplementing the ISAF rules, not changing them. Does this mean there is something wrong with the rule itself, that it has to be changed in an appendix to the rules even though Appendix K is only a guide? To this I would suggest yes!

What is therefore wrong with Rule 35 as at presently written? Let us remind ourselves what the rule currently states:

35. TIME LIMITS and SCORES

If one boat sails the course as required by rule 28.1 and *finishes* within the time limit, if any, all boats that *finish* shall be scored according to their finishing places unless the race is *abandoned*. If no boat *finishes* within the time limit, the race committee shall *abandon* the race.

It is the last sentence that seems to cause the most problems when race officers either misjudge the time it takes to complete a race and fail to set a course which does finish within the time limit or fail to shorten the course before the expiry of the time limit, perhaps because the wind dies on the last leg. In each case it appears that time limits are a nothing but a trap for race committees - an alligator with mouth wide open waiting to devour a race, spit it out and abandon it for no good reason!

So we must again ask the question: What is the object of a time limit ? In my view there are only three reasons to have times limits in races. Firstly, to allow further races to be sailed in the day. Secondly for safety or fairness, to ensure the day's sailing is completed before dusk and thirdly in the case of a function requiring the sailors to be ashore in time. What other reasons can race time limits be for ? Using these three reasons, why cannot race committees be given the final decision on whether a race is abandoned or not after the expiry of a time limit ? Imagine a beautiful sailing day and the first boat in the last race arrives at the finishing line two minutes after the time limit but there are no further races or evening functions and it is a long way from becoming dark. Under the present rule, if not changed in the SIs, the race committee **shall** abandon the race simply because rule 35 says so! The sailors become frustrated and the race committee goes home feeling a great sense of loss.

So do we need a new rule 35? Surely yes! While not pretending to be a rules composition expert I suggest that the rule might indicate that a race will only be abandoned by the race committee if further races are to be sailed or if there is a safety or fairness issue such as the onset of dark

or dropping wind or an event organisation issue, such as a function, that requires sailors to be ashore in good time. The rules experts might consider the following draft words in a new rule 35 designed to avoid frustration in competitors and stress for race committees, and sometimes even for protest committees and international juries !

35 TIME LIMITS and SCORES

If one boat sails the course as required by rule 28.1 and *finishes* within a specified time limit, then all boats shall be scored according to their finishing position. However, boats that fail to *finish* within any later period stated in the sailing instructions, will be scored DNF. If no boat *finishes* within the time limit, the race committee shall *abandon* the race to enable further scheduled races to be sailed or for any other reason directly affecting the safety or fairness of the competition or administration of the event.

In other words, the race will not be abandoned unless the reasons given after '*abandon*' apply.

Robert Milner

Tornado European Championship

Las Palmas – 6th – 13th March 2004

Jury: Georges Ardiley (FRA) Chairman
Jordi Lamarca (ESP) Manfred Piso (AUT)
Pierluigi De Luise (ITA) John Buckingham (GBR)

An excellent event with perfect arrangements for all. The pickup from the airport was on time although the plane was late. We did not recognise each other though I had worked with Jordi two years ago. Straight to the hotel which again was very good and

then the short walk to the Real Club Nautico de Gran Canaria – what a place! Certainly nothing like it in the UK – 7000 members and facilities to match.

Met the other Jury members and looked around the boat park, launching area, swimming pool, basketball and tennis courts and then a meal, a few drinks and back to the hotel. Next morning, breakfast in the hotel, then to the club for the first jury meeting to establish the routine for the day. Basically, Jury meeting at 9.30; on the water at 11.30 to arrive at the starting area by noon. Back ashore at about 15.30 for lunch and then await protests or other problems. Protests usually 17.00 or thereabouts until all were decided; then back to the hotel for a quick shower and change before assembling at the club for the evening meal; back to the hotel about midnight.

The protest meetings were conducted in a very efficient and quick manner without being over hasty. I made a point of being in the boat park each morning as the competitors were preparing for the day in order to chat to them about the previous day's racing and to answer questions (if I could and was prepared to) and to be there when they were coming ashore to inspect damage, of which there was plenty, and to help with recovery – much appreciated by tired sailors.

Bearing in mind that some countries were using this event as part of their Olympic selection, the racing was keen but not over the top. I suppose the thought of two Tornados colliding at maximum speed does tend to keep the aggression in check!

One question was put to us and I am still not sure we got it right. The competitors had to sign out and in. What is acceptable as a signature? Is a cross for signing out and a star of David for signing in acceptable? We thought not. The RRG might like to give their verdict.

All in all a very good event and I can recommend Las Palmas as a venue. Please do not all apply for 2005 until I have had a chance to go there again.

John Buckingham

*By contrast, a rather less efficiently run event in Portugal highlighted the problem **Robert** identified above when **Carol Haines** went to the Dart 18 Worlds in Lagos.*

Shoreside, the organization worked well at the Dart 18 Worlds but the Jury were kept busy by the PRO whose attempts to shorten course gave rise to eleven redress claims on two races: for his first finish the boat was anchored directly upwind of the windward mark and he recorded boats as they rounded the mark to port – then he dragged his anchor and opened the line so that the mark had to be left to starboard but failed to record those boats finishing correctly on the altered line.

The next day, with wind and time running out fast, he shortened by the downwind gate although a leg earlier would have been better. The first dozen boats passed between him and the nearer of the gate marks but then things got confused. Some went through the gate and hooked the finish. Some just went through the gate and were told by the Race Officer to clear the line because they had finished. Some unwound. Then the time limit expired. Fifteen from a fleet of over eighty finished correctly and in time; all the rest finished within ten minutes and got no result.

It's not cheap to go to a World Championship and the competitors deserved better than that. I'm just glad the Jury had tape recorders and that we at least knew the finishing order.

It was a great venue, though.